DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 722 HE 030 441

AUTHOR Burton, Larry
TITLE Overcoming the Inertia of Traditional Instruction: Final Report of the Social Work Faculty Development Program at Andrews University.
INSTITUTION Andrews Univ., Berrien Springs, MI.
PUB DATE 1997-07-23
NOTE 19p.; For the interim report, see ED 404 956.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Instruction; *Cooperative Learning; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Social Work; *Teacher Workshops; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Andrews University MI

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a 1996-97 faculty development program conducted for the social work department at Andrews University (Michigan). The training included the presentation of instructional theory, demonstration of instructional techniques, practice of the techniques by the participants, feedback on these practice sessions, and on-going support from peers and the training consultant. Day-long sessions were conducted in October and January, with 90-minute follow-up sessions scheduled 1 month after each day-long session. The focus of the initial session was on cooperative learning structures, while the second concentrated on the acquisition of informal cooperative learning techniques. Faculty study groups also met several times in the interval between the two sessions. The report concludes that for faculty development programs to be effective, the teaching aspect of faculty advancement must be emphasized as much as research, that faculty development initiatives need to be planned in collaboration with faculty, and that long-term development initiatives depend on the success of faculty study groups. Five appendixes provide the results of session evaluations and personal implementation logs. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 722

Overcoming the Inertia of Traditional Instruction

Final Report on the Social Work Faculty Development Program at Andrews University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

July 23, 1997

Presented to the Chairs Council
The College of Arts & Sciences
Andrews University

Larry Burton, Consultant

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Larry Burton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NE 630 .Y41

Final Report on the Social Work Faculty Development Program at Andrews University

During the 1996 - 1997 academic year the Social Work Department at Andrews University conducted a faculty development program focusing on the instructional role of the college professor. The opportunity for this faculty program arose after the beginning of the fall term. As a result, a program design was developed that attempted to fit the time and resource constraints of the department. In addition, I wanted the to include in the program design the essential elements identified in the research of effective faculty development.

The Design of the Development Program

The training framework was based on the work of Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers (1988). Following this model, the training included the presentation of instructional theory, demonstration of instructional techniques, practice of the techniques by the participants, feedback on these practice sessions, and on-going support from peers and the training consultant. This training regimen has been shown to produce long-term results in the transfer of training to the classroom.

After an analysis of the needs of the department based on both the typical knowledge and skills taught in the social work program, I suggested the following content for program:

1. cooperative learning strategies — to improve everyday instruction,
2. Dimensions of Learning (Marzano et al.) — to improve instructional planning, and
3. the role play strategy — to refine a technique already in use.

Due to the time constraints of the department, instructional training was to be delivered in three all-day sessions conducted on the fifth Wednesdays of October, January, and April. A 90-minute, follow-up session would be scheduled one month after each all-day session. As was anticipated, adaptation of this plan was needed as the year unfolded. First, the training in Dimensions of Learning, a "unit" planning approach, was replaced with training in individual lesson planning. Second, due to the intense pressures placed on the department by the accreditation process and visit, all professional development activities were suspended during Spring Quarter.

The Initial Training Immersion

The first training session was conducted on Wednesday, October 30, 1996. All nine faculty members of the Social Work Department were present. Due to personnel changes during the course of the year, seven of the original nine continued throughout the staff development program.

The focus of the initial training session was cooperative learning structures. Throughout the day I "used the method to teach the method" (Joyce, 1991/92) That is, I used the same cooperative strategies during my presentations that I wanted the participants to later use in their classrooms. The faculty were introduced to five different cooperative techniques (and their variations) in the first training session — including both simple and complex cooperative structures. These included Turn to Your Neighbor (Pairs), Think-Pair-Share, Jigsaw and Expert Jigsaw, Numbered Heads Together, and Roundtable.

In addition to emphasizing cooperative learning in the content of the training session, I presented the concept of whole-faculty study groups as a vehicle for supporting instructional change. Research in K-12 schools has shown whole-faculty study groups to be a powerful tool in the support of instructional improvement (Murphy, 1991, 1995). Study groups consist of four to six individuals who meet regularly (an average of at least an hour a week) with the explicit purpose of program improvement (Green & Henriquez-Roark, 1993). In this case the specific focus is on improvement of instruction in the program. At the beginning of the training session I placed the faculty members into two study groups. The entire day of training was experienced in the context of these study groups.

I used an evaluation form to receive feedback on the initial training session. This data has been helpful in preparing later training sessions and in understanding the perspectives of the faculty members. All numeric ratings fell within the range of 1.1 to 1.5, with 1 being the best possible score and 5 being the worst (see Attachment 1). One written suggestion asked that I plan time into the training session for faculty members to "design together possible implementation of stuff learned in this class." That had actually been designed into the day, but was dropped due to lack of time. The purpose of the study group is to provide time for those types of experiences.

The January Training Immersion

After completion of the initial training session and the 90-minute mini-session in November, the faculty members who had no previous training in cooperative learning were experiencing frustration in their attempts to use cooperative techniques in the

classroom. The training thus far had not been enough to empower them in the beginning use of cooperative learning. In planning the all-day session for January, I decided to drop the Dimensions of Learning training, which would have taken the entire day, and do further training in cooperative learning. The primary focus of this round of training would be the acquisition of informal cooperative learning techniques from Johnson, Johnson, & Smith (1991). These are techniques that can easily be used to "interrupt" a traditional lecture and improve student factual recall. The secondary focus of this session was experience in planning to teach cooperative lessons. We closed the day with a debriefing session, trying to "fine tune" the development program and make it more user friendly, particularly the weekly reporting process. As a result, a revised reporting form was created in the form of a check sheet (see Attachment 2).

As after the initial training session, I used an evaluation form to receive feedback on the January training session. All numeric ratings fell within the range of 1 to 1.4, with 1 being the best possible score and 5 being the worst (see Attachment 3).

The Implementation Process

The primary purpose of a faculty development program is to improve the quality of instruction occurring in an academic program. This typically involves the implementation of an instructional innovation in an effort to alter the instructional status quo. Therefore, if the selected educational innovation is not being implemented in the classroom, the development program is not a success.

Personal Implementation Reports

I used two sources of data to assess the implementation process: the personal implementation log and the study group log. Between the October training session and the January training session there were six instructional weeks, therefore the possibility of receiving six personal implementation logs from each professor. One professor submitted four personal logs, one professor submitted three personal logs, two professors submitted two logs each, two professor submitted one log each, and two professors submitted no personal logs (see Attachment 4). One of the professors who did not submit the "official" personal logs did submit a narrative listing of all cooperative techniques used throughout the fall quarter.

The reported use of cooperative techniques ranged from no reported uses to 10 reported uses. The most used cooperative structure during this reporting period was Think-Pair-Share and its variations. The one faculty member who did not report, submitted a complete summary of activity for the fall quarter after the January training session.

The January training appears to have been a metaphoric hurdle for some of the faculty members. Hesitance to use cooperative techniques appeared to wane. Confidence in personal abilities to use the techniques seemed to grow. In the five weeks following the January training session, faculty reporting increased. I credit that to the simplified, check-sheet style reporting form we began using at that time. We also began to give faculty members the option of reporting by e-mail. The summary of the reports received between February 5 and March 5 is found on Attachment 5. Again the

most used cooperative structure is the Think-Pair-Share family. This is closely followed by the simple Pairs technique. An important trend noted during this phase of reporting was the increase in the total number of cooperative techniques used.

Study Group Reports

Between the October training session and the January training session, one faculty study group met twice and the other study group met three times. These meetings occurred during the three weeks immediately following the October training session. Thanksgiving Break interrupted the process, followed quickly by Christmas break. Then the pressures of starting a new quarter worked against the resumption of study group meetings before the January training session. Following the January training session, I only received one report of a study group meeting.

The major concern or obstacle that has emerged in the implementation of study groups is time. Both study groups have identified "finding time when all study group members can meet" as being a challenge. With the full schedules we keep as faculty members this came as no surprise to anyone. So, study groups are vital to the success of faculty development programs, yet the structure of the academy works against the easy implementation of study groups. The solution to this conundrum is an opportunity that awaits our action.

Lessons Learned

Change is not often achieved in a whirlwind of activity, but in a dedicated, persevering effort to take many small steps in instructional improvement while never losing sight of the ultimate goal — improvement of outcomes for our students.

We can learn lessons from the initial analysis of the qualitative data collected during this program. Some of these lessons may not technically be new. Many could have been anticipated from the literature on K-12 school improvement, but they are still "new" to us in higher education.

1. Change is a process that requires commitment at several levels — university, college, department, program, and personal. If commitment at any of these levels is questionable, the change process will be sabotaged.

2. For change to occur, commitment must be translated into several specific actions: dedicating time to training, dedicating time to regular collegial interaction focused on the initiative, financial support from administration, and patience with the frustrations that are inevitable with the change process.

3. Implementation can begin small and grow from there. However, if the growth occurs too slowly, the initiative will probably die. In this initiative, we almost started too slowly (see #4 below). One way of getting a faster start would be to schedule the initial training for three consecutive days prior to the beginning of the academic year. The days throughout the year would be excellent as follow-up training days.

4. A certain minimum number of hours of initial training (at least 15 - 20) is required before we can realistically expect faculty members to begin implementation. The number of hours required before implementation begins is inversely proportional to the extent a faculty member already uses instructional innovations ***and*** their commitment to the initiative.

5. The Law of Inertia (an object at rest tends to stay at rest unless acted on by an external force; an object in motion tends to continue in its path unless acted on by an external force) seems to apply to the implementation of instructional change. In our faculty development program, the "object" (which is already in motion) is "instructional practice." It appears that an adequate "initial force" must be applied in order to change the current "instructional practice" trajectory. These forces include training, personal choice, collegial support, administrative support, and the culture of the work place. Each individual requires different combinations and strengths of forces to create positive instructional change.

6. Study groups must meet regularly and keep their focus on instructional improvement if they are to function as a support mechanism for instructional change. Otherwise, individuals are left in instructional isolation.

Recommendations:

1. The teaching aspect of faculty advancement must receive equal billing with the research dimension of advancement. There must be some type of incentive for a faculty member to intensely engage in the improvement of instruction. For some, personal satisfaction will be enough, but that is not true for all. We must begin to make our teaching public and derive a measure of esteem from teaching well.

2. Future staff development initiatives need to be planned in a collaborative effort between faculty members and a staff development consultant. This will allow faculty members to "own" the program from the start and not feel like the program is being "handed down" to them.

3. The design of faculty development programs needs to be based on research of effective development programs. These programs typically include (1) presentation of theory, (2) demonstration of instructional skills, (3) practice of instructional skills, (4) feedback about the quality of this practice, and (5) long-term follow-up through peer coaching and/or study groups.

4. Success of long-term faculty development initiatives is dependent on the success of the faculty study groups. However, unless adaptations can be made in the culture of the work place to promote and expect the regular meeting of the study groups these types of faculty development programs will not reach their full potential.

Attachment 1:
Evaluation Summary

October 30 Training Session

1. Quality of the presentation:

	Best rating	Average for this session	Worst rating	
Interesting	1	1.4	5	Dull
Well prepared	1	1.1	5	Poorly prepared
Effective Techniques	1	1.2	5	Poor techniques
Sensitive to Audience	1	1.1	5	Oblivious to audience

2. Value of these materials:

	Best rating	Average for this session	Worst rating	
Practical	1	1.3	5	Unrelated to my work
Useable	1	1.5	5	Not useable
Recommend this session	1	1.3	5	Would not recommend

3. If I had to do it all over again I would attend this workshop.

	Best rating	Average for this session	Worst rating	
Definitely Yes!	1	1.4	5	Definitely No!

4. **Please make comments that would help us to improve the workshop.** What went well? What would you like us to do differently? (Constructive criticism and compliments gratefully accepted.)

It was well done.

Time to design together possible implementation of stuff learned in class.

Liked: Sharing, turn-taking, questions answered
Refreshed my memory, affirmed my skills — thanks
You allowed our foolishness

I like color overheads with some graphics for variety.

May want to nudge us gently back on task (delicate task) but we do need to keep spontaneity as well.
Genuine, relaxed style.
Appreciated flexibility of task.

Attachment 2:
Personal Implementation Log

# of Uses	Cooperative Technique
	Turn-to-Your-Neighbor (Pairs)
	Think-Pair-Share
	Think-Pair-Square
	Think-Square-Share
	Jigsaw
	Expert Jigsaw
	Numbered Heads Together
	Roundtable
	Roundrobin
	4S Brainstorming
	T-Chart
	Corners
	3-Minute Pause
	Discussion Pairs
	Note-taking Pairs
	Advanced Preparation Pairs
	Q&A Pairs
	Closure Writing Pairs
	Implementation Assignment
	Other:
	Other:
	Other:

Reflective Question:

Is this faculty development program meeting your needs? If yes, how is doing this? If no, what are your needs and how do you think they can best be met?

Feedback Requests:

I need help with a specific technique

I need to talk with the consultant about

I need help with . . .

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Attachment 3:
Evaluation Summary

January 29 Training Session

1. Quality of the presentation:

	Best rating	Average for this session	Worst rating	
Interesting	1	1.4	5	Dull
Well prepared	1	1.2	5	Poorly prepared
Effective Techniques	1	1.2	5	Poor techniques
Sensitive to Audience	1	1.4	5	Oblivious to audience

2. Value of these materials:

	Best rating	Average for this session	Worst rating	
Practical	1	1.2	5	Unrelated to my work
Useable	1	1.2	5	Not useable
Recommend this session	1	1.0	5	Would not recommend

3. If I had to do it all over again I would attend this workshop.

	Best rating	Average for this session	Worst rating	
Definitely Yes!	1	1.4	5	Definitely No!

4. **Please make comments that would help us to improve the workshop.** What went well? What would you like us to do differently? (Constructive criticism and compliments gratefully accepted.)

Change the time of day offered

Enjoy your adapting to college level, your going with our flow, and willingness to accommodate our need for efficient reporting mechanisms!

A very minor suggestion, but I personally prefer color overheads with occasional graphics — clip art or whatever.

Attachment 4:
Personal Implementation Log Tabulation

Reports Received Through Wednesday, January 29, 1997
Six Weeks of Instruction

Cooperative Technique	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Totals
Reports turned in	**1**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**written summary**	**9**
Turn-to-Your-Neighbor (Pairs)	1							1
Think-Pair-Share	1	2		5	3	1	3	15
Think-Pair-Square								
Think-Square-Share								
Jigsaw							2	2
Expert Jigsaw								
Numbered Heads Together		2						2
Roundtable								
Roundrobin	1			3				4
4S Brainstorming								
3-Minute Pause		1						1
Other:						Quiet Signal — 1	Random Call — 2 Agree/ Disagree — 2 Simulation — 1	6
# of reported uses	3	5	0	8	3	2	10	31

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Attachment 5:
Personal Implementation Log Tabulation

Reports from February 5 through March 5, 1997
Five Weeks of Instruction

Cooperative Technique	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Totals
Reports turned in	**2**	**4**	**4** (Summary for fall quarter)	**2**	**3**	**0**	**4**	**19**
Turn-to-Your-Neighbor (Pairs)	4	2	(10)		7		6	19 (10)
Think-Pair-Share	7		2 (5)	1	10		7	27 (5)
Think-Pair-Square								
Think-Square-Share								
Jigsaw		1	(1)				1	2 (1)
Expert Jigsaw					1		2	3
Numbered Heads Together	1		(2)				2	3 (2)
Roundtable		3						3
Roundrobin			(1)		5			5 (1)
4S Brainstorming	1						1	2
T-Chart	2	2	(1)				3	7 (1)
Corners								0
3-Minute Pause							2	2
Discussion Pairs			(1)		5		3	8 (1)
Note-taking Pairs	1	1						2
Advanced Preparation Pairs			2 (4)					2 (4)
Q&A Pairs							2	2
Closure Writing Pairs			6					6
Implementation Assignment								0

Cooperative Technique	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Totals
Other:	Writing - 1 Random Call - 1		Role Play - 2 (3) Simulation - 1 (3) Taba - (1) Mult. Intel. - (4) Synectics - (1) VIEN - (1) Tag Debate - (1)	Group Problem Solving - 1 Show & Tell - 1			Mid-Term Exam - 1	8 (14)
Personal Totals	18	9	52	3	28	0	31	102(39)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Green, W.H., & Henriquez-Roark, R. (1993). Study groups in schools: A collegial way to improve your teaching. The Journal of Adventist Education, 56(1), 27-30.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Smith, K.A. (1991). Active learning: Cooperation in the college classroom. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Joyce, B.R. (1991/1992). Cooperative learning and staff development: Teaching the method with the method. Cooperative Learning, 12(2), 10-13.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1988). Student achievement through staff development. New York: Longman.

Marzano, R.J., Pickering, D.J., Arredondo, D.E., Blackburn, G.J., Brandt, R.S., & Moffett, C.A. (1992). Teacher's manual: Dimensions of learning. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Murphy, C. (1995). Whole-faculty study groups: Doing the seemingly undoable. Journal of Staff Development, 16(3), 37-44.

Murphy, C.U. (1991). Lessons from a journey into change. Educational Leadership, 48(8), 63-67.